The Social Science Bulletin

A REVIEW OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AT MISSISSIPPI STATE COLLEGE

April, 1952

VOL. V, NO. 4

A SCHOLAR AND A GENTLEMAN
by Peyton N. Rhodes 1

SOME CURRENT ISSUES IN GRADUATE EDUCATION
by N. Paul Hudson 5

THE HUMPHREY ERA AT MISSISSIPPI STATE:
"Making Good in a Big Way"
by John K. Bettersworth 9

EXTRACTS AND ABSTRACTS:

The 1950 Census and Farm Migration
by Harald A. Pedersen 18

FRANK BURKITT: The Man in the Wool Hat
by Mrs. H. H. Broadway 20

EVENTS 23

ACTIVITIES 24

Published bimonthly and distributed gratis by the Social Science Research Center of Mississippi State College. Acceptance under section 34.64 P.L. & R. authorized. All communications should be addressed to the editor, Box 148, State College.

MISSISSIPPI STATE COLLEGE

The Social Science Research Center

A Scholar and a Gentleman

by

Peyton N. Rhodes
President, Southwestern University

NOTE: The following is an address delivered by Dr. Rhodes before the scholarship day convocation at Mississippi State College on April 3, 1952. Because of its timeliness it is herewith reprinted in the Bulletin.

In the old days, before there were so many elective "educational tokens", which ofttimes versatile ignoramuses accumulate and successfully barter for an academic degree, there was a term which was used to describe the best product of our colleges. It was the term "Scholar and Gentleman". It described the sort of individual I wish to discuss, for I feel that there is a certain necessary and inevitable connection between scholarship and gentle living. Gentle living is not to be confused with a lazy existence.

The term "an educated man" was often used in those former days, and men thought they knew what an educated man was. He was a man who knew, or had known, certain things, and it was assumed that in acquiring these things his mind had gained a kind of power or poise and an openness to ideas which made this man, in distinction from others not so disciplined, a man of education. An open mind was not confused with an empty head. By virtue of a certain discipline, assuming, of course, that he had done his part in the process, this educated man entered into a fellowship of rare value both to himself and to others.

If we try to analyze this somewhat vague connotation we find that the essential quality of this education was expressed by the word liberal. It embraced thorough scholarship, good manners and good morals. Persons so educated had seized their chance to fix solidly in their character the largeness and beauty of the intellectual life. Into whatever activity they might now turn they were bound to carry with them that essential thing, which, for lack of a better name, we may call a liberal spirit. If they had made a proper use of their chance, they could never be mere specialists in their chosen fields. Their special and technical skills would always be infused with that higher and larger spirit of culture on which the true professional spirit must rest. Expressed in terms of the inner life such a scholar was, and was generally recognized to be, a gentleman.

The art of living is the most important and the most difficult in which to achieve success, and we believe with Emerson that "a beautiful behavior ... is the finest of the fine arts." Whatever changes may occur in the social, economic or political spheres the scholar and gentleman will never be outmoded or insignificant. It is he who sets the pace - who has a sense of excellence.

Let us examine a little more closely some of the attributes which may well characterize this scholar and gentleman. Each of you indeed may make his own list. For myself, since our subject is a phrase a bit old fashioned, I will pass along to you a few old fashioned observations, some of them based on a little book called "Mere Literature and Other Essays" written by Professor Woodrow Wilson, whom many of us still honor as the greatest president of the twentieth century.

I. I would say a scholar and a gentleman must know to a considerable degree the general history of man in his world and the basic cultural ideas which have guided man's development.

When we reflect on the fact that no place in the world is more than sixty hours by air away from any other place now, it must give us a certain sense of dismay when we realize how unfamiliar we are with the history and the cultures of most of the peoples whom we could so readily visit in just a few hours. When one's associates slip over to Scotland or Japan for a brief business trip or drop down to Rio for a long weekend we are inclined to be more impressed with

our facilities of transporation than we are with the great thoughts that have shaken mankind. But the ideas of man and the elaboration of principles constitute our real knowledge.

All of us are rather provincial in our thinking and we come forth with very positive statements on all manner of international issues without the slightest idea of the internal situations which affect the people to whom we may be giving glib advice. This was impressed on me recently by a speaker who was discussing different points of view about the daily bath which many of us think is a highly desirable event. This gentleman pointed out that to those peoples who bathe only once a year by custom and preference we Americans seem very dirty people if we require a bath every day. On the other hand, to certain religious groups in Asia who bathe several times a day, we seem equally dirty because we do not bathe often enough. It's all in the point of view. I once years ago heard a distinguished bishop make a remark that has stuck with me. He said, "It doesn't matter particularly whether you know what you would have done if you had been in the other fellow's shoes, but it is very important for you to understand what he would have done in his own shoes, under the same circumstances." History is the frame of reference into which all else must fit - politics, economics, science, the fine arts, and religion. Or to put it another way, the framework into which ideas must fit.

You may have read under "Education" in the March 17 issue of TIME of the forthcoming publication of the startling Syntopicon, a remarkable set of volumes which is supposed to provide adequate reference for the student on one hundred and two of the great ideas which have concerned mankind. These volumes are supposed to provide for the thinking human mind the essential data on the important issues which mankind has faced in order that these issues may be explored further and related to one's present life. "It is principles, everlasting principles ... which the rising generation requires if it is to find its way through the mazes of tomorrow." (Hutchins)

II. In the second place, I might suggest that the scholar and gentleman must be skillful in speaking, writing, and reading his native language. I do not mean that one has to be a Demosthenes or a Maurice Evans, enunciating each syllable with crystal clarity, or an orator capable of spellbinding the natives from the sun-kissed shores of California to the rock-ribbed coasts of Maine, but one should be able, I think, to use competently a vocabulary adequate to express with force and exactness the ideas which he wishes to project. This is just the opposite of what is called "bafflegab" an excellent term invented to describe the oblique opacity of governmental directives. The same thing holds true of writing. How few people can write at once and without hesitation just exactly what they want to say. During the war a high ranking officer told me that the chief trouble he had in his department was instructing newly created second lieutenants in the gentle art of writing messages with assurance and saying exactly what was supposed to be said. He stated that few of these young men could compose a telegram accurately. The teeth marks on the front ends of pencils and the back ends of pens give mute testimony to a certain lack of facility in recording ideas.

As for reading with comprehension I need only quote to you a statement made in the year 1344 in the first English book on the joys of reading, written more than a hundred years before the invention of printing. In this volume there are found these words describing books: "These are the masters who instruct us without rods and ferules, without hard words and anger, without clothes or money. If you approach them, they are not asleep; if investigating you interrogate them, they conceal nothing; if you mistake them, they never grumble; if you are ignorant, they cannot laugh at you. ... Whosoever therefore acknowledges himself to be a zealous follower of truth, of happiness, of wisdom, of science, or even of the faith, must of necessity make himself a lover of books."

III. In the third place, a scholar and a gentleman, certainly in these days must have some understanding of the significance of science in our modern culture. Generally most people are willing to leave anything more complicated than striking a match, which incidently involves a rather complicated reaction, or pressing a light switch to that highly respected but slightly curious and awesome individual called a Scientist - with a capital S. The number of outstanding scientists will always remain small.

Speaking as a physicist, I think it is perfectly safe to assume that very few students will ever learn very much natural science and that very few grown-ups will ever do more than enjoy the end products of pure science and technology. Yet these people do our buying and selling, our legislating, our national planning, and occupy the highest specialized professional fields, through all of which run the unmistakable and inescapable effects of scientific activity. They are not ignorant people, other than in their understanding of what science is , what it can do, and what are its limitations. Somehow we must manage for the scholar and gentleman to have a scientific awareness and alertness, a feeling for how science affects the sum total of experience and attainments which we include in the general term "culture".

Admittedly, it is hard enough to define what science is, much less to teach it to people. Dr. James B. Conant, the distinguished chemist president of Harvard, has offered the following definition as a sort of first approximation. Science is "that portion of accumulated knowledge in which new concepts are continuously developing from experiment and observation and lead to further experiment and observation." The examination of scientific history will show that many concepts are fruitful and others die on the vine. The fruitful concepts, interwoven and interrelated, constitute what we know as modern science. The essence of science, therefore, is a sort of dynamic quality which results in the development of more and more concepts arising from continuing experimentation and observation, very much like the continuous unwinding of a bolt of ribbon with fuzzy edges. These fuzzy edges get sheared off if they are the unfruitful or discarded concepts, but a straight, smooth, clean-cut ribbon of achievement flows on and away and out of sight into the future, tying together this future with the present and the past. "To succeed in science it is necessary to receive the tradition of those who have gone before us. In science more perhaps than in any other study, the dead and the living are one." (Charles Singer)

The Greeks gave us the start in science for they exhibited to a marked degree, nobody seems to know exactly why, the intellectual curiosity and a certain attitude or approach to life which created a philosophy and a practical curiosity which were to develop ultimately into natural philosophy or science. The scholar and gentleman, in his attitude towards science, must avoid at all costs helping produce for us a land such as T. S. Eliot described in his bitter prophecy when he said

"Here were decent godless people:
Their only monument the asphalt road
And a thousand lost golf balls"

IV. As a fourth characteristic of the scholar and gentleman I would say that he must have a continuing and vital religious experience. In a little book called "The Education of Man" containing the aphorisms of Heinrich Pestalozzi, the amazing Swiss educator of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, will be found the following, which illustrates admirably my point, "All man's life on earth is but a stage in his education, in which his powers and aptitudes are developed for all eternity in accordance with the Creator's will." And again, "The higher purpose of education is to prepare the individual to make free and self-reliant use of all the faculties with which the Creator has endowed him, and so to direct these faculties that they may perfect all human life; each individual, in his proper place, should be able to act as the instrument of the omnipotent, all-knowing Power that has called him into being." "Religion of itself will make no merchant, tradesman, scholar, nor artist. But it rounds out what it does not give, it hallows what it does not create, it blesses what it does not teach."

Many of us face each day with a feeling of futility. We ask ourselves why bother about the future when everything seems to be going to the dogs, or to the Russians. Taxes are unbearable, socialism is overtaking us, and maybe around here in the engineering departments the thermodynamiters are saying that the entropy of the universe is approaching a maximum at an alarming rate of speed. We must realize that out of apparently thwarted and beaten peoples have risen those forces that gave life and enthusiasm to a following age. Out of the dark ages came the Renaissance; out of the gloomist days of our own country emerged persons in the providence of God on whose wisdom and planning have hung the entire structure of our free country. The scholar and gentleman will be sustained by a great faith, and will say to himself, "I can do all things through God who is my strength." "To love God," said a wise preacher, "is to believe, despite every appearance to the contrary, that conditions favorable to the highest development of the human spirit can be created."

V. And finally the scholar and gentleman is conscious of the fact that his education is a process which will go on through life making every day a challenging opportunity for him to both learn and to teach. We hear a great deal these days about adult education. All sorts of devices from study groups to television are being employed to enable people of maturity to satisfy those longings and plug those gaps in their formal education which they have been unable to fill before. In turn these people stimulate others to a revitalized intellectual effort. There are really very few people who are not anxious "to improve their minds". They just do not seem to get around to it. They vegetate rather than grow mentally. There are so many exacting duties of the home and business and the professions that people who are just plain tired at the end of a day are too worn out to do anything more than watch the wrestling matches on television or to play canasta until midnight or to dance in a crowded, smoke-filled club. Yet others, and increasingly more and more, are taking up as avocations some worthy educational feature, trying to improve their community, their state, or the nation by improving their own understanding of the world's great ideas. If I may dare make a prediction today, I would say that in ten years the whole field of education for adults, people who may or may not have attended or completed college, people with families, busy people, will be as significant an educational enterprise as even education in the colleges and universities. The scholar and gentleman will be among those in the vanguard of this movement.

And so on this historic day, a day marking the signal achievements of those whom we are gathered here to honor and who are so richly deserving of the warmest commendation for obstacles overcome and objectives achieved, I leave for your consideration these five - and indeed there might have been ten - qualifications that I believe fitly apply to that old fashioned but ever new fashioned person, a scholar and a gentleman.

Some Current Issues in Graduate Education

by

N. Paul Hudson, Dean, Graduate School
Ohio State University

NOTE: The remarks that follow were delivered before the Conference of Deans of the Southern Graduate Schools in Atlanta, November 26, 1951.

I am not one to look back with nostalgia to "the good old days." Those days were good in many respects, but I truly believe that the balance of good and bad at present is distinctly in the direction of good. I need only to compare the type of graduate education I received 30 years ago with what is commonly given now, at least in my own field, to realize that vast improvements have been made in the intervening time.

Nor am I saying that the insidious influences of these times are more acute or comparatively more deleterious than formerly. In fact, I do not wish to make comparisons with former times, and I shall attempt to treat of contemporary issues. Wiser men and those with longer perspective may be able in time to make valid comparisons.

The growth of knowledge is undeniable and an effort to impart that knowledge through improved education has been society's fortunate lot. Graduate education has taken part in the forward educational movement, but probably not to the same extent as in other fields, such a primary and secondary education, medicine, law, and engineering. I will not here attempt to discuss why graduate education, the crowning level of formalized studies, has not received the same degree of concerted and intentional attention as elsewhere in the educational world.

This does not imply that no efforts have been made to promote the improvement of graduate education. The annual meetings of the Southern Graduate Deans are instances of a desire on the part of those responsible for graduate work to advance their interests through exchange of ideas and discussions of common problems.

It is in this spirit that I here wish to discuss current influences which I see operating against the ideals, at least, if not the basic structure of graduate education. I am not going to discuss each issue to the extent it deserves; it is the composite picture that I am attempting to present. Then I mean to point out our responsibilities and just a little of what we can do as graduate deans.

The first issue I would present is the current trend toward technical training in the graduate school and the ambition of certain fields to be labelled "professions."

There is nothing wrong with technical training, and for those young people who have interest and ability in skills rather than in intellectual pursuits, a training in craftmanship is honorable and to be encouraged. But that type of training should not be in the graduate school and standard graduate degrees should not be conferred for technical proficiency. While opportunity for the development of skills alone is more commonly found in certain areas, this abuse of the objective of graduate education lies more frequently at the door of individual professors, and of those departments whose personnel is skill-minded.

The tendency for certain fields to idolize the title of "profession" is related to training in technics, but is a somewhat broader and less frank issue than education in skills. It seems to me that the ambition held by some areas to be called a "profession" is a deceitful effort to gain respectability for technical training. The definition of "profession" is so difficult and subject to so many interpretations that no formal action can be taken against the movement on the basis of terminology, and hence it grows apace. It is both self-deception under a false guise and a misleading nomen for the young graduate student.

Both technical and so-called "professional" graduate education are deviations from intellectual scholarship, and when in the graduate school result in graduate degrees cheaply and falsely bought. These possible abuses of graduate education are more common in the fields of the natural sciences. However, they appear increasingly in the social sciences where the technics and terminology of the natural sciences are sometimes mimicked, where methods of measurement are frequently attempted, and sometimes where the means of investigation are glorified as the ends. "Know what" and "know how" are substituted for "know why." The status quo of knowledge takes the place of principles and historical perspective, and foundations for development are sacrificed for immediate proficiency.

Consistent with the tendency to minimize the intellectual for the mechanical is the lack of appreciation of language study. If graduate degrees are marks of advanced mental achievement, the recipients should be preparing for intellectual careers and leadership. If such careers and leadership are to be significant, the results of further study should be made known, accurately and intelligently, to colleagues and more broadly to society from which the advanced education comes. Ability in communications thus is a responsibility of those privileged to have a graduate education, and training in the use of common English as well as of the technical language should be a serious requisite for and a part of graduate education.

The current disdain for foreign languages is an example of scholastic misunderstanding and lack of appreciation. It is not realized what an inspection of language in general as well as knowledge of particular languages have to contribute to the ability to transmit thought. When pupils in the grades are taught to read English by the line, paragraph and page for speed, when examinations are regularly of the "true-false" type, when seminar reports are presented in outline or haltingly by mouth, when faculty advisers write their students' theses in despair and to save time, when the library is terra incognita, when graduate students begrudge the time spent on the study of foreign languages for which they see no "need," when apologists for foreign language requirements have no argument other than that foreign languages are "tools" of research, when graduate students have trouble in foreign language examinations because they do not know English--I say that when these things are happening under the guise of education, we are producing illiterates not fully prepared for the responsibility of transmission of thought. Under these circumstances, I fear that we are restricting the intellectual efforts of the immediate future and not exploiting to the fullest the potentialities of scholarship in our students. (I would almost go so far as to ask where our future scholars are coming from, and whether, to produce the one, nine other potentials should not have to toe the mark for the privilege of entering the race.)

Is the demand for the practical, the usable, the utilitarian so dominant that scholarship and the evidences of scholarship are being minimized?

This limitation of graduate work to the pragmatic in education is exemplified by the recent pronouncements that the graduate work of prospective teachers should exclude language studies and research, and emphasize so-called professional training. The same persons would allow, for those who may enter the investigative field, narrow specialization in graduate education and over-emphasis on training in research. This separation of two prospective careers at the beginning graduate level presupposes that the decision of direction is to be made at the outset of graduate work before aptitudes and opportunities are apparent. This separation further implies that the teacher will not need training in investigation because he will have no need for an inquiring mind, that the teacher will not have the desire or opportunity to conduct research, that research is the exclusive right of those in certain particular positions, and that scholarship has only the narrow meaning of intellectual effort leading to published research. The statements of this dichotomy have been widely heralded, and no one has bothered to answer the false gods. Those graduate students who are influenced by the current atmosphere of "know what," and who pursue the easier, more practical, and less intellectual course, mistake the real intent of graduate education, and the true purpose of graduate schools is diluted by their presence.

A somewhat related problem arises in connection with the content of a student's graduate program. Knowledge has grown to such an extent that a subject-matter department expands its offerings and multiplies its courses in order "to cover the subject." Similarly, a graduate student is induced by his preceptors

and the threat of general examinations to register for all the courses in the department he can take during his stay in the graduate school. The result is that too many students unduly concentrate and sometimes limit their studies to their own subject department. The practice entails two fallacies: that the subject if worthy of graduate study can be "covered," and that it has no interrelations with the subject matter of other departments. The first supposition is basically wrong, because no student should be misled into thinking that his subject field is not going to grow in the future. He should be encouraged to prepare for growth, both of his subject and of himself. The second error is based on the misconception that a field is self-sufficient, even at the graduate level. Understanding of relationships is essential for effective perspective and for future growth through self-development. The times encourage the cramming of knowledge as facts in a limited scope, instead of continued basic education in principles, movements, and interralationships. This point of view, which I express, does not allow for a smattering of knowledge, but a depth of understanding through broad as well as deep study.

In the issues that concern us these days, there are educational policies and principles on which we naturally do not all agree. I think we do agree, however, that scholarship and quality in intellectual achievement are highly desirable characteristics of graduate education. We recognize accomplishment by conferring graduate degrees on those who demonstrate certain standard abilities. The value of such degrees depends on their worth as coins of the intellectual realm. In these days of excessive numbers of graduate students, the integrity of the degrees conferred is an important question. We can multiply the number of degrees granted without cheapening them intellectually, if each is validated by being honestly earned. The threat, however, is that through the influence of certain factors, the work that goes into a degree and the attention given to its worth may be less than academic standards should allow.

The factors that militate against the full value of degrees include some mentioned above: the tendency to technical and professional work in the graduate school; the disregard for the responsibilities and values in language study; the separation of language studies and research from preparation for teaching; and the narrow factual rather than the broad and deep graduate education. Add to these the numbers we struggle with these days, whereas graduate education, properly conducted, is highly individualized education. In some areas, the demands for graduate education are in advance of sufficient numbers of qualified faculty to provide the quality of work expected. The validity of the graduate degree is at stake and the academic integrity of the faculty and administration is tested by the circumstances of the times.

Another task concerned with the value of graduate degrees is the evaluation of student performance in candidacy for the degree. Honest appraisal of quality of work is an inherent part of the responsibility in conferring the degree. The obligation of quality in achievement lies initially, of course, with the student. But the evaluation of his performance is cooperatively a task of the individual faculty member, the departmental staff and the office of the graduate school.

We have conducted a study of the scholastic difficulties of graduate students, based on our data and on our personal experience in counselling students. We have no firm conclusions, but we feel very strongly that the basic reasons for student difficulties are these: inadequate preparation for the rigors of graduate work, lack of understanding on the part of students of their responsibilities for their own education, poor counselling, and importantly the complexity of the lives of graduate students these days. Under this last heading comes the common practice of marriage with attendant family responsibilities, necessity of employment, and housing and "in-law" problems. In graduate work, I do not share the "swim or sink" point of view. There is too much at stake in human lives and in education itself, in the way of prices paid by the individual and by society, not to make investments of all kinds worth their while and to utilize all that can be secured in human intellectual resources of our society. Opportunity and scholastic ability should be the bases of achievement in the graduate school.

In the consideration of these various academic and educational problems, the highest type of judgment, and intellectual integrity are called for. That this is not always the case these days is a matter of grave concern to us. Too often the attitude is that "what I can get away with is right." Too often the minimum is the objective. Too often responsibility is placed on the other fellow.

Too often the educational program is constructed according to so-called "G-I Benefits." Evasions are condoned, even when no one but the evader suffers. Educational counsel is given without adequate thought. "Public relations" is a shibboleth more important than academic standards. Intellectual integrity is not an issue considered worth teaching or discussing.

Let me repeat what I said at the outset, that I am not comparing these days with former days. I just wish to point out that these issues I have presented are with us, in my opinion. Instances of intellectual dishonesty are not numerous but I fear that the problems I have mentioned are illustrative of an atmosphere of materialism, and anti-intellectualism. Are the words "usefulness," "tool," "need," "technics" to take the place of "scholarship," "thought," "originality," "responsibility," "contemplation," "basic research"? Is the step from Einstein's law to a hydrogen bomb the expression of achievement these days? Is the quick return in dollars the current standard of ambition? Has the word "service" dropped out of our vocabulary? Is teaching to be cynically labelled as that activity which one enters because he does not have ability or gumption to do otherwise? Is the current attack on universities an expression of opposition to liberalism and intellectualism? Is the glorification of our standard of living to be in terms only of our material wealth and comforts, and not in reference to all the abstract things that go to make up a good life? After all, perhaps these attitudes toward higher education are just an inevitable sequel of a materialistic war--an unavoidable complication following an acute and severe disease--from which mankind will recover in time.

I want now to confess that I do not know if I have accurately described the current issues that seem to me to militate against the ideals if not the basic structure of graduate education. Each graduate dean has the responsibility of observing and studying the situation as he meets it. I want also to disavow any intention or ability to prescribe the therapy for the ills I have described, even if my diagnoses are correct. If we judge the circumstances of these days to be influencing adversely the fullest intellectual achievement in graduate education, our job is not to fight a rear-guard action, nor to whistle in the dark. Our responsibility is to act as educators, more than mere administrators, and the role for us graduate deans is one of leadership.

I deal with the essentials of this leadership in terms of principles, letting each of us translate the principles into specific details as circumstances indicate. First, we must be certain that our own educational and administrative affairs are conducted with unimpeachable integrity. Within integrity I include those abstractions that have to do with what is right and good, attention to the individual student and his needs, not abject conformity to rules and rigid insistence on mechanics of graduate education. Second, we must influence our faculties to exemplify intellectual honesty in their teaching, research and student counselling. I choose the word "influence" advisedly, because police action or the administrative whip does not convert anyone or lead to lasting results. A rope is to lead with, not for pushing or prodding. Third, through our acts and pronouncements we can take a stand for the true objectives of graduate education: individuality, inquiry, understanding and scholarship. These days will be succeeded by other days. We have a great opportunity of leadership to guide the present to the future.

The Humphrey Era: "Making Good In A Big Way"

by

John K. Bettersworth

The year 1934 may be regarded as a sort of turning point in the history of Mississsippi State College. The subsequent years, in spite of war and rumor of war, have seen a persistent physical and academic growth of the college. With politics more or less reduced to a minimum, and the eventual establishment in 1944 of a "constitutional" board of trustees upheld by a constitutional referendum by the people, the administrative stability of the college has been reasonably certain. To assure its progress the college has been fortunate in having presidents who spared no efforts to advance the interests of the school and make it a vital part of the life of the state. George Duke Humphrey began this period of growth and Fred Tom Mitchell has continued it.

George Duke Humphrey was elected president on June 5, 1934. The board had considered only one other person for the position, Vice-President A. B. Butts, and Humphrey won over Butts by a single vote.[1] One year later Butts became chancellor of the University. While there was at first some opposition to Humphrey, especially from the Jackson Daily News, this newspaper itself was soon agreeing that Humphrey was "making good in a big way."[2]

Humphrey was born in Tippah County in 1897. After graduation from the Tippah County A.H.S. he entered State Teachers College in Hattiesburg, later going to Blue Mountain, where he was one of the few male students. The irreverent never allowed Humphrey to forget his Blue Mountain upbringing, and when word reached the State College campus that Humphrey was to be its new president, the Reflector made some loud comments about "lace on the drawers." Humphrey's career before coming to the college carried him through teaching, high school administration, and county superintendency to the role of state supervisor of high schools.[3] Meanwhile, he had earned an M.A. degree at the University of Chicago in 1931 and was in the process of completing his doctorate at Ohio State when elected to the presidency of Mississippi State College.

Humphrey plunged into his task with the zeal and enthusiasm of a man who was the youngest president since Hardy. The depression was still on, but by now the New Deal largesse was beginning to be felt at the college, and federal funds were being made available to needy students.[4] The federal government also made loans or outright grants for construction and repair work on the campus. Already the main dormitory and the first two floors and auditorium of Lee Hall had been remodeled.

Under Humphrey came the remodeling of the hospital and Montgomery Hall and the building of two new dormitories, Hull and Magruder Halls, a group of faculty apartment houses, and a portion of a new stadium. These, too, were built in part with either federal funds or loans.[5] Other building was contem-

---

[1] Minutes of the Board, June 29, 1934.

[2] Humphrey Scrapbook, June, 1934-June, 1935.

[3] (Idem.)

[4] Minutes of the Board, Jan. 25, June 19, 1935; June 29, 1936; June 6, 1939; Commercial Appeal, Sept. 5, 1935.

[5] Minutes of the Board, June 29, 1934; January 25, 1935; Jan. 29, Oct. 25, May 4, 1938; Minutes of the Administrative Council, Sept. 29, Oct. 20, 1938.

plated, and Humphrey was constantly seeking funds for a new gymnasium, an auditorium, a library, and a General Science building, and in 1944 he advocated the construction of a War Memorial Building.[6] Actually Humphrey's plans were not idle dreams, for the enrollment was expanding so rapidly in the late thirties that the building program was far behind. Thanks to an intensive campaign of recruiting, the enrollment rose from 923 in 1933-34 to 1229 in 1934-35, 1598 in 1935-36, 1937 in 1936-37, 2174 in 1937-38, 2286 in 1938-39, 2308 in 1939-40, and 2496 in 1940-41.[7]

Humphrey was zealous in his efforts at academic expansion. In June, 1935 he told the board:

> One of the maxims of wise old Marcus Aurelius was: "Observe always that everything is the result of a change, and get used to thinking that there is nothing Nature loves so well as to change existing forms and to make new ones like them." Education also is a constantly changing process. The important thing is that it should be an evolving change. Change for the sake of change is no good. But there is no use to decry change. The wise leader, so far as in him lies, directs change for the better.[8]

The record of changes, both actual and proposed, under Humphrey is impressive.

Raising of standards was a vital issue from the beginning of the Humphrey administration. Already a program designed to standarize the employment qualifications of agricultural extension workers had been undertaken as a result of criticism in the Peabody report, and after many reservations and delays was put into effect.[9] During the 1934-35 session plans were laid by the college for improving instruction and in 1936 a special committee was set up to direct this program.[10]

One of the frontal attacks made by Humphrey on the instructional program was concerned with the curriculum, and the term "curriculumectomy" was much bandied about by the faculty during this era of reconsideration of courses of study. Naturally, the faculty were not entirely in agreement either with the president or among themselves as to what should be done, but, taking the Peabody report as a guide, the college made an effort to achieve some uniformity in offerings on the freshman-sophomore levels--a sort of embryonic program of general education. About all that resulted was a preparation of the curricula in each school into upper and lower divisions, with some small degree of uniformity in each school as to its freshman and sophomore requirements. As for the college as a whole, only such freshman courses as English, composition, military, and physical training were uniform--all else was utter diversity. At any rate, the minimum of uniformity thus achieved was a boon to the confused high schools and junior colleges, whose attempts to train for senior college entrance on either the lower or the upper levels had been confounded by the lack of uniformity among the basic curricula of the senior colleges. At the same time, Mississippi State was at work on all fronts to establish closer contacts with high schools and junior colleges, and the result of the good will thus created was quite apparent in the enrollment increases made by the college in the Humphrey era.[11]

---

[6] Minutes of the Board, March 16, June 6, 1939; June 5, 1941; June 14-15, 1944.

[7] (Ibid.), June 6, 1939; Biennial Report, 1941, 36.

[8] Minutes of the Board, June 19, 1935.

[9] (Ibid.), April 27, June 9, December 14, 1933.

[10] (Ibid.), June 29, 1936.

[11] (Ibid.), Jan. 25, June 18, 19, 1935; Commercial Appeal, April 15, 1935.

ideal location for such an official. In January, 1935, Humphrey recommended[21] and the board formally approved the restoration of the school of education. It was some months before the school could be reorganized, but in the autumn of 1935 S. B. Hathorn, who was also to serve as director of instruction, assumed charge.

With the restoration of the school of education the losses of the preceding twenty-five years were at last recovered and the balance of undergraduate schools at Mississippi State was restored. It was now possible to obtain at the college the essential training that the "industrial classes" in Mississippi were most likely to require. Now the college could implement the gains made. With administrative organization at last approaching stability, the fields of agriculture, science, engineering, business, and education were now able to develop with proper administrative leadership, each striving to improve itself.

One of the weakest links in the academic armor of Mississippi State College was the liberal arts, particularly the humanities and social studies. General Lee had felled the embattled classicists in the eighties in a move which was quite necessary at a time when the haughty humanistic phalanxes needed to taste the bitterness of defeat and learn to justify their reason for existence. Henceforth the liberal arts had had to fight their way back into the curriculum. English, of course, never lost face entirely, but a great deal of emphasis was placed on such practical phases as the art of public speaking. A modicum of social science also remained, but it was of a very fragmentary sort, involving elementary instruction in history, civics, and economics, with occasional diffident excursions into sociology. What attention the curricula paid to the social sciences came largely as a result of the personal appeal of A. B. Butts and John Herbert in government and A. W. Garner in history and economics. Sociology was a stepchild, sometimes appearing in the government department, sometimes disappearing completely. While Humphrey came at a time when the social sciences were still almost universally deemphasized in technical education, he did insist upon their expansion at Mississippi State College. In August, 1934 he recommended the creation of a department of sociology, and in January, 1935 the department was established and located in the school of agriculture.[22] That the plans of the president included additional expansion in the social science field is indicated by a report to the board in June, 1935 that he contemplated further reorganization.[23]

From the start, Humphrey undertook to expand and coordinate the agricultural program of the College. "I fully realize," he said, "that Mississippi is an agricultural state and that it will possibly always be so. Any industrial activity is certain to prove a side issue, and, therefore,....I shall attempt to develop the agricultural element to the fullest extent possible..."[24] In January, 1935 Humphrey recommended and the board approved the appointment of J. R. Ricks to head the School of Agriculture, the Agricultural Extension Service, and the Experiment Station.[25] This combination followed a rather concerted effort from certain quarters to move agricultural extension to Jackson and abolish certain branches of experiment station work.[26] In June, 1936 the board created the title of agricultural coordinator which was assigned to Ricks, who held the post until his death in 1938 brought this attempt at unification to an end.[27] In 1940, four years after the education school had been revived and encharged with agricultural education, a similar unification step

---

[21] Minutes of the Board, Jan. 25, 1935.

[22] Minutes of the Board, Aug. 24, 1934, Jan. 25, June 19, 1935.

[23] Ibid., June 19, 1935.

[24] Scrapbook, June, 1934-June, 1935.

[25] Minutes of the Board, January 25, 1935.

[26] Ibid., June 29, 1934.

[27] Ibid., June 29, 1936.

was made in the creation of the post of coordinator of agricultural education.[28] Dr. Clarence Dorman, who had taken over the directorship of the experiment station after the death of Ricks, assumed this position.[29]

The School of Agriculture, under the egis of a special committee of the board of trustees, made considerable progress under Humphrey.[30] This committee visited other schools in the nation to learn of their problems and policies. One of the first important steps in the enrichment of the agricultural program under Humphrey came as the result of a state-wide movement to set up a department of forestry as an agency in the state and federal conservation program. As early as 1926 an extension forester had been employed by the college, and in 1927 President Walker had recommended the separation of forestry courses from the botany department and the creation of a chair of forestry.[31] Although the board was agreeable, nothing farther was done at that time toward the creation of the new department, and it was not until January, 1935 that the department was actually established.[32] At first a two year curriculum in pre-forestry was set up.[33] By 1944 Humphrey recommended the establishment of a full-scale school of forestry, which the board authorized in 1945.[34] Lack of funds hampered this ambitious project, but a four-year forestry curriculum did come into existence at this time.

Progress in other agricultural fields was not neglected. In 1944, when Humphrey made his most elaborate series of recommendations for academic expansion to the board, he proposed the creation of a school of veterinary medicine. In the same year an enlargement of the work of the dairy department was proposed. In both cases the board approved, but fruition of these plans was delayed because the war was still on and funds were lacking.[35]

In the fields of science and engineering there was considerable activity, but the ravages of budget and war were to hamper rapid improvement. From the outset Humphrey was tortured by the criticisms of the accrediting associations, which were forever complaining of the parsimonious budgetary allotments for science and engineering and the inadequancy of laboratories and equipment. Humphrey constantly sought increased appropriations for these branches.[36] While only one of the engineering departments, that of Civil Engineering, had lost its accredited standing as a result of the "1930 happenings," restoration came during the 1934-35 session.[37] Nevertheless, there were constant threats of loss of accrediting and inevitable "reservations." In 1938 Humphrey told the board that the Engineering Accrediting Association was withholding recognition on the grounds of insufficient equipment and low salaries, and he asked for adequate legislative appropriations to remedy these conditions.[38] In order to secure the needed equipment special funds set aside by the legislature for repairs and construction in the state institutions were diverted.[39] Meanwhile, although salaries were increasing very slowly, members of the engineering staff were busily completing advanced degrees, over one-third being on leave by the summer of 1939.[40]

---

[28] Minutes of the Board, May 24, 1940.

[29] Ibid., June 4, 1940.

[30] Minutes of the Board, Jan. 29, 1937.

[31] Commercial Appeal, June 16, 1929; Minutes of the Board, Oct. 4, 1927.

[32] Minutes of the Board, April 17, June 29, 1934; July 25, 1935.

[33] Report of the President, June 6, 1939.

[34] Minutes of the Board, June 14-15, 1944; August 7, 1945.

[35] Minutes of the Board, June 14-15, July 12, 1944.

[36] Minutes of the Board, June 29, 1934; May 24, 1940.

[37] Minutes of the Board, June 19, 1935.

[38] Minutes of the Board, January 26, 1938.

[39] Report of the President, June 6, 1939.

[40] (Idem.)

Humphrey concerned himself with curriculum problems in engineering from the start. Not only was there some consideration of a general course in the "broad field of engineering,"[41] but also there were steps toward further development of specialized fields. In 1937 Humphrey proposed and the board conditionally approved the establishment of a ceramic engineering department.[42] Actually, all that resulted was the setting up of several experimental elective courses in the department of geology.[43] Efforts were made meanwhile to improve facilities in chemical engineering in order to achieve satisfactory accrediting.[44] Humphrey also wished to establish a department of architectural engineering, which he recommended first in 1936 and again in 1944. At the latter date the board approved the recommendation, but no action was taken to set up the new curriculum.[45] It was scheduled to be offered by the drawing department.[46] Also in 1944 Humphrey obtained authority from the board to create a department of petroleum engineering to serve the rapidly growing oil industry of the state.[47] The result was a new major in petroleum geology offered by the department of geology and geography.

Aeronautical engineering, which began in 1933, was, of course, greatly expanded as a result of World War II. Before the entry of the United States into the war, civil aeronautics work was allotted to the college and pre-training of air corps cadets was undertaken on the campus during the war.[48] Accrediting of the aeronautical engineering department was delayed, however, largely because of the fact that by the time the department was becoming well established, its staff was depleted by calls to the service. Nevertheless, plans went on, and in January, 1943, while the air corps program was at its height, creation of a school of aviation and aeronautical engineering at the college was authorized.[49] One year later, as the army program waned and the civilian student body decreased, all that remained was a nominal department of aeronautical engineering, all of whose staff were on leave! Still undaunted, Humphrey continued to seek recognition by the Engineering Council for Professional Development.[50]

An engineering experiment station was established in January, 1941. While such a project had been discussed before, the lack of funds had prevented action. Actually, it was the national defense program, with its promise of Congressional legislation to provide funds, that brought success.[51] Moreover, the wartime E.S.M.D.T. activities created a large-scale program of an extension nature, which brought a new awareness of the need for expanding the services of the engineering school beyond the bounds of the college classroom. It was not until October, 1944, that the new experiment station was actually put into operation and upon recommendation of Dr. Mitchell in 1945 it became known as an Engineering and Industrial Research Station.[52] Under the jurisdiction of the school of engineering, its threefold purpose was (1) to do research on "problems involving the application of engineering principles;" (2) to cooperate with the agricultural experiment station and similar state or federal agencies; and (3) to "receive and furnish information within its field for instructional purposes for use by schools and colleges."[53]

---

41 Minutes of the Faculty, Sept. 6, 1939.

42 Minutes of the Board, Jan. 29, 1937.

43 Minutes of the Faculty, Feb. 2, 1937.

44 Report of the President, June 14, 1944.

45 Minutes of the Board, June 29, 1936, June 14-15, 1944.

46 Report of the President, June 14, 1944.

47 Minutes of the Board, June 14, 15, 1944.

48 Minutes of the Board, Jan. 31, 1941.

49 Mintues of the Board, Jan. 28, 1943.

50 Report of the President, June 14, 1944.

51 Minutes of the Board, Jan. 31, 1941.

52 Minutes of the Board, April 26, 1946.

53 Catalogue, 1948-49, 289.

The business school was enjoying considerable prosperity when Humphrey came, its enrollment usually placing it second or third in size on the campus. Dean Bowen constantly demanded enlarged facilities and additional staff. In August, 1934, Humphrey brought a member of the state vocational educational board, F. J. Hubbard, before the trustees to promote a program for the training of teachers of business subjects. This activity was eventually authorized by the board in January, 1935.[54] In June, 1939, the board created the Business Research Station, with R. C. Weems, Jr. in charge. It included among its numerous public service activities, the publication of the Mississippi Business Review. In 1940 Dean Bowen died and was succeeded by Robert C. Weems, Jr. Although World War II took the new dean on military leave with the Navy and activities were considerably curtailed by losses in faculty and students, the business school did not lose its vitality. It contributed materially to the E.S.M.D.T. program, in which it cooperated with the school of engineering.

Cooperation with the engineering school was no new thing. Already a curriculum in commercial aviation had been set up by the business school with the aid of aeronautical engineering. Likewise a joint program between the management department in the business school and the machanical engineering department was drafted and put into operation in 1945 as a major in institutional and industrial management.[55]

As professional training was expanded, standards were raised, and the qualifications of the staff were brought up to the requirements of accrediting associations, the college began to consider its graduate program. For many years graduate work had been somewhat of a hit-or-miss activity. After its rather feeble beginning under Lee and Hardy, a rather concerted effort to organize graduate work on a systematic basis had come with the Hightower administration. In 1912 graduate minors in social sciences and humanities were authorized. In 1913 a committee on courses of instruction under B. M. Walker undertook to deal with the whole problem of graduate curricula, and in 1914 a graduate committee was established for the general supervision of the program.[56] In October, 1914 regulations were set up governing the graduate program, and in November, 1915 uniform requirements for the theses were adopted.[57] In 1915 the granting of professional engineering degrees was authorized by the faculty.[58] In 1931 new regulations were adopted, including a reading knowledge of either French or German, a requirement that was modified in 1938 to allow departmental exceptions.[59] By the thirties the organization of a graduate school could no longer be delayed, and on January 9, 1936, upon the recommendation of Humphrey, it was established.[60] The first dean of the school was Henry Pochman, who was also head of the department of English. At last a real graduate program began to be developed. Fellowships and scholarships were set up.[61] When Pochman resigned in 1938, Herbert Drennon returned to the college as dean.[62] Although temporarily hampered by the war, the development of the graduate school was to make rapid advances afterward.

World War II, like its predecessor of 1917-18, was a blow to the academic life of the college. Many of the faculty went into the armed forces or defense work, and during 1942 volunteering and selective service began to eat away at the enrollment. While the civilian academic life deteriorated, defense activity began to take its place on the campus. As early as July, 1940 the State Vocational Board sponsored a defense training program for electric welders at the college.

---

54 Minutes of the Board, August 24, 1934; Jan. 25, 1935.

55 Minutes of the Board, June 14,15 1945.

56 Minutes of the Faculty, March 25, 1912, November 10, 1913; Bulletin of the Graduate School, 1936,3.

57 Ibid., October 10, 1914; Nov. 3, 1915.

58 Ibid., Feb. 24, 1915.

59 Minutes of the Faculty, Feb. 23, June 6, 1931.

60 Minutes of the Board, Dec. 17, 1935; Jan. 9, 1936.

61 Minutes of the Board, June 29, 1936; Minutes of the Faculty, Oct. 11, 1939.

62 Minutes of the Board, May 4, 1938.

Soon the college embarked on an elaborate extension training program which spread to all parts of the state under the E.S.M.D.T. Both resident faculty and available specialists in local communities were employed in the program.

Already having an R.O.T.C. program, the college stressed preparation for army work more assiduously than ever. In 1942 the time devoted to R.O.T.C. was increased by two credit hours per semester.[63] Meanwhile, the college was cooperating with the Navy in a number of its training activities, including the V-5 and V-7 programs.[64] In the fall of 1942 an officer candidate school in transportation for the Adjutant General's Department was established and early in 1943 the college became a participant in the Army Air Forces Training Program.[65]

The civilian student body was one of the major problems of the college during the war. With enrollment dwindling and students jittery over the imminent arrival of calls from selective service boards, the college placed emphasis upon a speeding up of the academic program. In December, 1941 there was talk of adopting the three-semester plan.[66] The maximum student class loads were increased in February, 1942 in order to speed up graduation.[67] By April the "accelerated program" was ready to be put into effect.[68] At first it involved nothing more drastic than a twelve week summer session with a total semester hour load of eighteen.[69] Later, the school year was actually divided into three 16-week semesters.

With depleted staffs the schools found it increasingly difficult to meet the demands on them, particularly since under the accelerated program, nearly every course in the catalogue had to be offered every semester. In an effort to achieve greater uniformity in the freshman year, a common course for all students was adopted in 1943, consisting of English, algebra and trigonometry, American history, American government, eight hours of science courses, compulsory courses in physical education and military, and six hours of free electives.[70]

By the session of 1943-44 the enrollment situation had become acute. Although a pre-induction course was set up to attract youths awaiting their calls, the situation did not improve.[71] By the summer of 1944 the army training program had also been abandoned at the college, and quite a number of faculty members were obliged to go on leave "for the duration." Meanwhile, a campaign to attract women students began, Magruder Hall having now been set aside as a dormitory for girls.[72]

The wartime students, fledgings as most of them were, proved somewhat of a problem both in scholarship and discipline. As early as November, 1943, the flunking situation had caused the administrative council to adopt the mid-semester progress grade report and to set up a system of counseling and "special

---

[63] Ibid., Sept. 12, 1942.

[64] Ibid., Dec. 27, 1941; Jan. 9, 1942.

[65] Ibid., October 16, 1942; Feb. 20, 1943; Minutes of the Board, Jan. 28, 1943.

[66] Minutes of the Administrative Council, Dec. 27, 1941.

[67] Ibid., Feb. 17, 1942.

[68] Minutes of the Board, April 28, 1942.

[69] Minutes of the Administrative Council, Jan. 9, 1942.

[70] Minutes of the Administrative Council, April 6, 1943.

[71] Minutes of the Administrative Council, March 11, May 25, 1944.

[72] Minutes of the Board, June 14-15, 1944.

assistance" for students with unsatisfactory grades.[73] Soon a study hall was instituted for remedial purposes, and shadows of the strict military discipline of the past began to haunt the campus civilians.[74]

But 1944 was the low ebb, and the end of the war in 1945 brought rapid recovery. Returning veterans began to flood the campus by the fall of that year, and an extensive post-war educational expansion was at hand.[75] In the midst of these changes, G. D. Humphrey received a tempting offer to become president of the University of Wyoming. Although the board increased his salary somewhat, they did not equal the offer from the West, and in June, 1945 President Humphrey submitted his resignation.[76] While the board canvassed the field for a successor to Humphrey, Clarence Dorman, director of the Agricultural Experiment Station, served as acting president.[77]

The administration of George Duke Humphrey had not been an easy one. In fact, during these years the college was plagued with the growing pains occasioned by the first opportunity it had had in years to go its way without fear of political meddling. All of the present academic divisions had by now come into existence, including the graduate school. The word research was beginning to be heard around the campus in other quarters than the Agricultural Experiment Station. Holders of the doctorate began to appear more often among the Academic Staff. At last the college was growing up.

But in the Humphrey decade the college also had to experience other pains than those of growing, for in the last half of this period Mississippi State, like other growing things of that time, was caught in the draft, so to speak. As was the case with colleges everywhere, staff, students, and standards were being scattered to the four winds. Yet, somehow or other the man who had been "making good in a big way" held Mississippi State College together. George Duke Humphrey had not been born and bred in the eroded hills of Tippah County for nothing. Like many a Mississippian who had spent his life hacking a way through hardships, he was an unterrified pioneer. So, while the college languished, he schemed about what it was going to be after the war was over-- new departments, new schools, new services. No wonder the westerners sent for him.

---

73 Minutes of the Administrative Council, Nov. 23, 1943.

74 Ibid., June 26, 1944.

75 Minutes of the Administrative Council, July 22, Sept. 22, 1944.

76 Minutes of the Board, June 13-14, 1945.

77 Minutes of the Board, June 14-15, 1945.

The 1950 Census And Farm Migration

by

HAROLD A. PEDERSON
Division of Sociology and Rural Life

NOTE: The following is an abstract taken from the December, 1951 issue of Mississippi Farm Research, a publication of the Agricultural Experiment Station.

Farm operators in Mississippi and the South generally, no doubt, find themselves remembering the good old days when a man didn't have to go out and look for hoe hands or cotton pickers. Most operators, 10 to 15 years ago, had enough workers on the place to handle the crop. If they did need a few extra workers during a rush period they only had to let it be known in town and they would have more than enough to handle the extra work.

Today the picture has changed. Small farmer and planter alike are feeling the pinch of labor scarcity. The extent to which farm workers have left Southern farms is revealed by the data published in preliminary releases of the 1950 enumeration by the Bureau of the Census. While the South gained nearly 6 million people or 13.3 percent from 1940 to 1950, the number of rural farm residents decreased from 16,344,000 to 12,197,000, a loss of more than 4 million people, or 25 percent, during the decade.

Other rural residents are generally believed to constitute a potential farm labor reservoir for seasonal and regular farm workers, although the validity of this assumption is doubtful. Nevertheless, in the South rural non-farm residents increased by nearly 2.5 million people during the decade. Even with this sizable increase in the rural non-farm residents the rural population in 1950 was nearly 7 percent below the 1940 rural population.

The loss of the rural population, however, was primarily a loss resulting from a change in the definition of the urban population. Urban population as defined in 1950 includes the suburban fringe which has not been incorporated into the official city limits. In 1940 and earlier these areas outside the city limits, with minor exceptions, were enumerated as rural non-farm.

The reclassification accounts for most of the loss to rural areas between 1940 and 1950 in the South. When the population is grouped according to the 1940 definition, rural areas in the South lost less than one percent during the decade. The gain in urban population is nearly 35 percent, plus an additional 14.2 percent increase due to the inclusion of the suburban fringe in the urban population in 1950.

Data on residential distribution indicate that even though a considerable number of people left farm areas, the potential farm labor reservoir, namely people living in rural areas, is essentially as large as in 1940. The fact still remains, however, that the Southern farm operator finds it increasingly difficult to obtain as many seasonal and regular wage hands as he needs or wants.

In periods of high economic activity and near full employment, such as have predominated in the post-war period, the pool of potential seasonal workers tends to diminish. There is a marginal scarcity which tends to disappear when farm wages reach a competitive level and a real scarcity which is the result of migration.

The marginal scarcity is referred to by the farmer himself in terms of the cost of labor. "There are plenty of workers, but not at a price I can afford to pay." The potential farm laborers among non-farm residents are already employed at wages equal to or better than the prevailing farm wage rates. It is also possible that they have other sources of income which may be terminated if they obtain even temporary employment on farms or elsewhere.

The real scarcity, which is the result of migration, is also related to the general economic level which prevails in the region or in the nation. The effect of economic cycles on migration is centered largely on rural-urban movements, which prosperity operates to accelerate and depression to slacken or reverse. Furthermore, the farm population is more responsive to economic cycles than is the remainder of the rural population.

An analysis of the age-sex distribution of the rural farm population in the South in 1950 tends to support these observations. In a stable population, one which has not experienced extensive migration, or other excessive losses, the population pyramid approaches the form of a symmetrical triangle. The most obvious deviation from the normal distribution observed in the farm population of the South is a very marked shortage in people aged 25-29. Less pronounced but still marked shortages occur in the age groups 20-24 and 30-34. Finally, there is a slight deficiency of women aged 15-19.

A second obvious deviation from the normal distribution is the very high proportion of children. Between 11 and 12 percent of the total population are in each of the age groups 0-4, 5-9 and 10-14. The age group 15-19 falls only slightly below this at 10 percent. The high proportion of children is indirectly associated with the problem of migration and labor scarcity.

Finally, the three age groups 35-39, 40-44, and 45-49 approach the normal distribution or are slightly over-represented. The male segments of these age groups tend to be over-represented and the female segments approach the expected proportion.

When the irregularities in the population pyramid for the farm population in the South in 1950 are related to the economic cycles of the past two decades the following relationships emerge. The population aged 35-44 in 1950 were from 15 to 24 years old in 1930. Hence, the workers in this group reached maturity and entered the labor force during the decade 1930-1940. The decade of the thirties was the depression decade and rural-urban migration was at a very low ebb. Farming at home offered the only real employment opportunities for the majority of the farm youth during the first half of the decade. A high proportion of the men enumerated in the age group 35-44 in 1950 were established as sharecroppers, renters, or farm owners by 1940. Many had married, and migration following 1940 would entail breaking up and re-establishing the household.

It was primarily the marginal workers, those who had been unable to adjust to farm work or find reasonably permanent tenure in agriculture, who were attracted by non-farm employment in town or farther afield following 1940 when defense and war production contracts began to expand employment opportunities. The extent to which these considerations have retarded migration is shown by the relative over-representation of farm people in the age groups 35-39, and 40-44 years in the 1950 population.

Moving down to the younger ages, persons from age 25 to age 34 in 1950 entered the labor force just before or just after 1940. Even among the older persons in this age group very few would have had time to establish themselves permanently as farm operators in competition with the older and more experienced workers who entered the labor force early in the depression decade. To this group, aged 25-34 in 1950, farm employment represented a meager income and all too frequently an insecure tenure. At best they could work as laborers the year round when the farm operator had work to be done and at worst they had to be satisfied with work during the peak labor demand periods of chopping and picking. In short, jobs were at a premium and few of the older workers quit their jobs to look for greener pastures. It is no wonder then that the young people and older young people departed when rumors of jobs in town, in the next county or in the next state began to sift back to the farming community early in the decade.

In 1940 there were 3,313,000 persons on the farms ranging in age from 15 to 24 years. Ten years later in 1950 these young people were 25 to 34 years old. The 1950 census shows only 1,299,000 persons in these ages living on farms. This is a loss of 60 percent during the decade. Since not more than 3 percent can be ascribed to mortality or deaths, this leaves a net loss due to migration during the decade of 57 percent of the farm population ranging in age from 25-34 years in 1950.

In contrast to other regions young men left Southern farms in larger numbers than young women. The loss during the decade was nearly 65 percent for males 25-34 years old in 1950, as compared to 57 percent for young women.

Two factors may explain in part at least this phenomenon. First, migration from farms in the South is preponderantly a long distance migration. Industry in the South, though expanding, is not able to absorb all the migrants from farms in the region and a considerable number continue to move to the industrial centers of the Northeast and North Central regions. Second, non-white groups are over-represented in the migration. Negro women have traditionally been accorded an independent status as farm workers in the cotton fields of the South. This is in sharp contrast to women in other farm areas where a woman has no occupational function other than that of housewife.

One further comparison between 1940 and 1950 reveals significant changes in the labor force on Southern farms. Nearly 60 percent of the population on farms in 1940 ranged in age from 15 to 64 years. This compares with 57.4 percent in 1950, only a

slight drop. However, young people (15-24 years) accounted for 20 percent of the total in 1940 and 16.5 in 1950. The mature workers (25-49 years) accounted for 28.5 and 28.2 percent respectively. The older workers (50-64 years) accounted for 10.7 in 1940 and 12.7 in 1950. The data show that, though the relative proportion of workers has not changed appreciably, the age composition of the labor force has changed. Farm workers in 1950 are considerably older than the workers which were available on farms in 1940.

SUMMARY

The above analysis shows that (1) the number of people living on Southern farms has decreased by 4 million persons or 25 percent since 1940; (2) rural non-farm residents are less likely to seek or be interested in farm work; (3) the loss in number of farm people is largely the result of migration from farms of young people ranging in age from 15 to 24 years; (4) persons ranging in age from 25-34 years have also migrated, but not in as large numbers;(5) young men have migrated in greater numbers than young women; (6) the relative number of productive workers in the population is slightly smaller; and (7) older people are more numerous among the productive workers.

Looking to the future, planters and small farmer alike will continue to feel the effect of out-migration. The small farmer, whether hill or delta, will continue to tell you with justifiable pride about the good job his son has in the city. The pay is good--"More money in a month than I used to make in a year. But I could sure use him right now--to help save the crop."

To the planter the story is much the same though it's not his own sons and daughters. It is the departure of the sons and daughters of the wage hands and share hands that troubles him. There always was in the past two or three young fellows ready to start a family and take over a crop for every worker who retired from the plantation. Judging by the number of youngsters playing around the cropper houses there ought to be that many and more even now. But as soon as they are big enough to do a day's work they are gone.

The heavy stream of migration from farms is likely to continue. There is little probability of an immediate reversal in the economy. And assuming that we continue at near full employment farm young people will continue to seek jobs in manufacturing and service industries in nearby or more remote urban centers.

Furthermore, the South has embarked upon an industrial development program for the region which will attract farm youth in even greater numbers. As the new industrial centers of the South expand and the demand for workers becomes greater the impact upon farm areas will become even more pronounced. Rather than diminish the movement from farms is likely to increase. Farm operators will be faced with the continuing problem of adjusting to a diminishing labor supply by substituting mechanical power for hand labor and animal power.

FRANK BURKITT: THE MAN IN THE WOOL HAT

by

Mrs. H. H. Broadway

NOTE: The following is an abstract of a thesis written by Mrs. Broadway for an M.S. degree at Mississippi State in 1948.

Henry Burkitt was a merchant, farmer, and politician who moved from North Carolina to Tennessee in 1819. His oldest son, Frank, followed in his father's footsteps professionally.

When the Civil War broke out, Frank Burkitt was in school in Virginia. He enlisted in the Tennessee cavalry, where he reached the rank of captain before he was paroled on May 15, 1865. For two years after the war, Frank Burkitt taught school in Alabama. Then he removed to northern Mississippi, where his father had already settled. In Houston, Mississippi, Frank became a contributor to the Chickasaw Messenger, a weekly paper, and soon purchased a part interest in it. In 1876 Burkitt and his partner, T. R. Schrimpner, moved the paper to Okolona and renamed it the People's Messenger, which later took the name, Okolona Messenger.

Here Frank Burkitt edited the paper for nearly twenty-five years.

Henry Burkitt held various political offices, including, in 1883, that of state senator from Chickasaw, Oktibbeha, and Choctaw counties. At the same time Frank Burkitt was serving in the state house of representatives.

As agricultural conditions worsened during the 1870's and 1880's, Frank Burkitt became the champion of the farmers' cause. He was very much interested in the Grange movement and served as State Grange lecturer for many years. His newspaper became the first in Mississippi to support the organization. Through it he supported regulation of railroads, fair taxation, and public schools for rural children. His interest in education led to his appointment as one of the first trustees of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Mississippi.

When the Grange movement began to weaken, Frank Burkitt transferred his allegiance to the Farmer's Alliance. This movement had started in Texas in 1878. By 1887 its influence had spread to Mississippi and a National Alliance had been formed, at last uniting all farmers in demanding alleviation of their sufferings. The Alliance campaigned for free coinage of silver, railroad regulation, government ownership of telegraph companies, improvement of waterways, restriction of liquor trade, industrial education in schools, promotion of the agricultural colleges, and the popular election of senators. However, its power soon began to decline because of internal dissension. The Populist Party was then formed to carry on the platform of the Alliance.

Burkitt's rise in politics paralleled the rise of the Alliance. He was a man of deep convictions, an able debater, and an independent thinker. He was famed for his attire, which consisted of a gray Confederate uniform and a conspicuous wool hat. His zeal for economy in government popularized him with the people.

Some of Burkitt's main criticisms in the late 1880's were directed against the state colleges, which he thought were spending too much per pupil. He thought there should be more common public schools, with college education more of a private matter for the rich.

Corporate interests also drew the ire of Burkitt. He felt they had exerted undue influence on politicians in matters injurious to the interests of the farmers. Railroads seemed to be the main offenders, as they promised to service the home towns of various legislators in return for favorable legislation.

Through his newspaper Frank Burkitt accused Governor Lowry of an unwise use of money which had resulted in getting the state into debt. In the interest of economy in government, he urged that certain state offices be eliminated and the salaries of the others decreased to a level with those of the people who elected them. To obtain good government, he felt most officials should be elected by the people in a fair and open election, instead of giving the governor extensive appointive powers.

Burkitt played an active role in the Constitutional Convention of 1890, but he became displeased with some of the provisions of the finished document and joined the Populist movement in criticizing it and some of the conditions which it tolerated, notably the educational requirement for voting, which promised to disqualify many illiterate whites.

At the meeting of the Alliance in Ocala, Florida, in 1890, plans for the organization of a farmers' political party were discussed. The committee in charge was deadlocked until Frank Burkitt presented his Ocala Platform, which was soon adopted with few changes. He had emphasized government ownership of railway, telegraph and telephone systems to please the North and the sub-treasury system to interest the South. This compromise cemented the cooperation of both groups. By 1892 the new party was already strong enough to nominate presidential candidates on a platform very similar to the one which Burkitt had advocated during his years in the Mississippi legislature.

Meanwhile Burkitt remained in the Democratic Party until July, 1892, when he resigned from the ticket as a presidential elector and began to support the Populist cause. This move brought the wrath of the Democrats against him and made him an object of a mud-slinging campaign. He ran for Congress in the fourth district on the Populist ticket, but was defeated. He nevertheless polled enough votes to alarm the Democrats.

Even though they were accused of cooperating with the Republicans and courting the Negro vote, the Populists continued to gain strength in Mississippi. In the election of 1895 they ran a full ticket, headed by Frank Burkitt as their candidate for governor. The platform, which Burkitt helped to write, called for free coinage of both gold and silver at 16 to 1, abolition of national banks, decreased taxes, limitation of the terms of federal judges, and an income tax. In his speech accepting the nomination, Burkitt sharply criticized the financial practices of the Democratic administration. The Democrats retaliated by adopting a platform very similar to that of the Populists and relying mainly on mud-slinging to fight the campaign. When the smoke cleared after the election the Democratic candidate, McLaurin, was the victor by more than three to one. Choctaw County was the only one which Burkitt had carried, and that only by a slender margin.

Undiscouraged, the Populists prepared for the national election of 1896. At the state convention, Burkitt served as chairman of the committee on resolutions. In St. Louis, the national convention of the Populists split over the nomination of Bryan as their presidential candidate. Burkitt believed Bryan to be strongly tainted with Democratic principles. This split was the beginning of the decline of the Populist Party, which almost disappeared in the next decade.

In Mississippi, the Populists were never too successful because they had few leaders, they were accused of friendship with Republicans and Negroes, and their main appeal lay in panaceas for bettering depression-caused economic conditions, which began to right themselves before the Populists could take strong action. When times improved, the Populists lost support.

In 1910 Burkitt sold his newspaper and turned to real estate. For a few years he was absent from the political scene, but in 1907 he returned to the lower house of the Mississippi Legislature. Here he again fought for more money for the common schools and less for the colleges. The next term he served in the state senate as a delegate from Chickasaw, Calhoun, and Pontotoc counties. When Bilbo ran for governor in 1911, Burkitt was his supporter and close friend. It was Bilbo who was at his side when Burkitt died in 1914.

GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD PROVIDES FUNDS FOR SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Dr. Mitchell has been notified by the General Education Board that funds have been provided to extend over a five-year period to enable Mississippi State College to strengthen its work in social sciences by initiating research and graduate training program in the fields of Social Psychology, Public Opinion and Political Behavior. The General Education Board will provide funds for paying half the salaries of two new members of the research staff of the Social Science Research Center; a social psychologist and a public opinion man. These two men will devote the major protion of their time to interdisciplinary research covering their related fields and emphasizing the local and community aspects of political and social group behavior. In addition to the new staff members, the college is to provide two special research fellowships, one in social psychology and one in political behavior. Further details on this program will be announced in the next issue of the Bulletin.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH SEMINAR MEETING, APRIL 30.

The final spring meeting of the Social Science Research Seminar was held on April 30 at 3:00 p.m. in the library auditorium. The topic for discussion was "Polulation Trends in Mississippi, as Evidenced by the 1950 Census." Dr. Ben Wofford served as moderator of the panel, which included Dr. Harald Pedersen, Dr. T. A. Kelly, Mr. H. P. Todd, and Mr. W. E. Christian. Everyone interested in social sciences was cordially invited to be present and participate in the discussions.

CHURCH AND COMMUNITY CONFERENCE

The fourth annual Church and Community Conference was held this year during Farm and Home Week, April 23 - 24. The "commissions" for this meeting were on "Church-Community Responsibilities to Special Community Organizations;" "Church-Community Responsibilities to Youth Programs;" "Church-Community Responsibilities to Family Life," and "Church-Community Responsibilities to Music." On Wednesday night the annual Christian Fellowship Dinner was held in the College Grill with Lieutenant-Governor Carroll Gartin as guest speaker.

SOCIOLOGISTS MEET HERE

The sociology and anthropology departments of the Universities of Mississippi and Alabama held a joint meeting with the staff of the Sociology and Rural Life Division of Mississippi State College here on Friday, April 18. This is the fourth year for a joint meeting with Ole Miss and the first year that the University of Alabama has participated. Cooperative work in graduate training and research was the topic for discussion. The afternoon sessions began with a business meeting and concluded with a seminar on community studies. The meeting concluded with a dinner in the Grill Banquet Room. Among the sociologists present were: From the University of Mississippi, Professors M. B. King, Julian Tatum and Rands; from the University of Alabama, Professors Solon Kimball, Morris G. Caldwell, Hansen, Thomas Ford, and Katner; and from MSCW, Professor Margaret Wood.

Activities

Dr. Warren E. Collins attended the meeting of the Technical Committee of Southern Regional Dairy Marketing Project which was held in Knoxville, Tennessee, April 2, 3, and 4. His bulletin, "Trends in Production and Disposition of Milk in the South, 1924-50," is now available for distribution.

Dr. W. E. Christian attended the Southern Regional Livestock Marketing Technical Committee in Atlanta, Georgia, April 24-25.

Professor William P. Carter was program chairman and vice-president of the Southwestern Council on Family Relations which met at Shreveport, Louisiana on March 14, 1952. He served as chairman and discussion leader for a section on Teaching of College Family Courses and was elected to the same offices for next year, and also placed on the executive committee. He also attended the Southern Sociological Society meeting in Atlanta, March 27 to 29.

Dr. R. J. Saville is now working on an article, "Trends in Production and Marketing of Mississippi Truck Crops." He has recently had two articles printed in the Mississippi Farm Research: "Livestock Changes in Mississippi Farms During 1951," which came out in the March issue; and "Intentions to Plant Show Acreage Increases for Soybeans and Rice," which came out in the April issue. He was re-elected chairman of the technical committee for the Regional Dairy Marketing Research Project at Knoxville, Tenn., April 2-4, 1952. He attended the Regional Farm Management Research Project in Memphis, March 17-19, and was chairman of the group. Dr. Saville is now reading a group of Ph. D. theses to select one for consideration for the awards offered by the American Farm Economic Association.

Miss Olive Sheets attended a conference of the Southern Cooperative Group, and the meeting of the school committee of the Regional Project S-5 on "The Influence of Wide Variations in Soil and Weather on the Growth and Nutritive Value of Vegetables," in Savannah, Georgia, March 17-20.

Dr. W. H. Barnard is working on the research project, "Teacher Tenure in U. S. and in Mississippi." He has recently had an article published in the Mississippi Educational Advance, January issue, entitled, "Teachers Need More Professional Stimulation." Dr. Barnard attended the state convention-Mississippi Congress of Parents and Teachers-in Jackson, April 16-19.

Dr. Harold F. Kaufman is preparing bulletins on "Use of Hospitals by Rural People in Four Mississippi Counties," and "Patterns of Participation of Rural People in Mississippi." His article, "An Approach to the Study of Urban Stratification," has been accepted for publication in the forthcoming issue of the American Sociological Review. He has written an article on "Sociology of Forestry" which will be published in the book, Forest Economic Research, to be published this summer. Dr. Kaufman gave a review of Nature and Human Nature by L. K. Frank in Rural Sociology 17:76-77, March 1952. He has been elected first vice-president of the Southern Sociological Society at the annual meeting, March 28-29, in Atlanta, Georgia. He participated in a joint staff meeting on April 18 with Sociology departments from University of Mississippi and University of Alabama. The program consisted of a seminar in community study, discussion of graduate training program and a dinner.

Miss Esther F. Segner is assisting eleven graduate students in making studies of housing, home equipment and practices - for curriculum and department planning improvement. She has just read galley proof on forthcoming book, Housing and Homemanagement, published by the Macmillan Company. She attended the meeting in Jackson with the Vocational Division of State Educational Department on policies for twelve-month homemaking teachers and also the M.E.A. meeting in Jackson. Miss Segner has recently talked with the Industrial Education students on "How Industrial Education Teachers and Homemaking Teachers can cooperate in teaching certain Aspects of Personal and Family Living."

Dr. Glover Moore has sent to the publisher the manuscript of his work, The Missouri Controversy.

Dr. Harold Snellgrove, who is serving this year as president of the campus chapter of Phi Kappa Phi, the national honorary scholastic society, presided at the first annual honors day at Mississippi State College on April 3. On April 17 he spoke before the Canterbury Club on "The Medieval Church."

Dr. Robert A. Brent addressed the Sorosis Club on March 26, using as his subject, "United States Foreign Policy." On March 28 he spoke before the Starkville Rotary Club on the international genocide convention. On March 24 he read a paper before the faculty reading club on "Thomas Jefferson's Notes in Virginia." He has also been serving as business manager of Town and Gown Players which was presented Noel Conrad's Blithe Spirit in Lee Hall Auditorium on April 30-May 1 at 8 p.m.

Dr. James H. McLendon and Dr. G. K. Bryan attended the Southwestern Social Science Association meeting in Dallas, April 10-12. Dr. McLendon has recently assumed the leadership in a project of the American Political Science Association involving a detailed study of the Mississippi Democratic Convention and its delegates to the National Convention. This is part of a nation-wide project covering all the states. Dr. McLendon has also participated in an evaluation of Perkinston Junior College, which took place on April 20-24. He served as chairman of the social studies group.

Dr. John K. Bettersworth has recently written three reviews for the New York Times Book Review. A review of Pierson's Yale College appeared on April 20. Reviews of Hamilton's Fifty Years of the South Atlantic Quarterly and Vandiver's Ploughshares into Swords: Josiah Gorgas and Confederate Ordnance will appear subsequently. Dr. Bettersworth addressed the Y.M.C.A. Faculty Club on April 7 on the subject, "Student Life Past and Present." On April 9 he spoke at the dedication of an historical marker at West Point, and on April 24 at Maben. On April 27-30 he will serve as chairman of the social science group for the evaluation of Pearl River Junior College. On May 5 he will address Torch, the junior honorary society at M.S.C.W. On May 7, he will deliver the annual historical lecture before the state convention of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, using as his subject, "How New was the Old South?" On May 30 he will address the convention of 4-H Club county winners on the subject, "Citizenship."

Mr. W. J. Evans has completed the manuscript of his first in a series of Mississippi Citizen's Guides, to be known as The Mississippi Citizen's Yes and No." The initial study deals with parties and elections. It will appear this summer.

Dr. J. D. Falls, head of the adult education department attended the annual meeting of the national University Extension Association in Austin, Texas, April 20-23. Dr. Falls was a member of the association's Committee on Records and Reports, and he served as recorder for the program of the Conferences and Institute Committee at Houston. He also participated in a panel discussion of improving cooperation among departments.

Dr. Fred W. Neal, associate professor of religion and philosophy, was elected president of the Philosophy Section of the Mississippi Education Association. Dr. Neal also addressed this group on "A Christian Philosophy of History."

Four members of the agricultural education department attended the Southern Regional Conference for Agricultural Education Workers at Richmond, Virginia, March 31-April 4: V. G. Martin, O. L. Snowden, J. R. Hamilton, and O. V. Clark. Professor Martin served as leader of a panel on "Methods and Procedures Used in Organizing and Conducting In-Service Training Schools." Dr. Snowden served as a member of a panel on "Methods of Determining Agricultural Engineering Training Needs from Field Studies." He also served as chairman of the Resolutions Committee. Professor Clark made a report as regional representative of the advisory committee to the Production and Marketing Division of the National Cotton Council, and also served as chairman of the session of Subject Matter Specialists. He also gave a summary report of the activities of the various state advisory committees in the Southern Association of Agricultural Engineering and Vocational Agriculture Educators.

Three visiting instructors will assist Miss Esther Segner, head of the homemaking education department of the college, in teaching the offerings of this department this summer. Miss Alberta D. Hill, professor of teacher education at Idaho State College, Pocatello, Idaho; Miss Frances M. Spratt, assistant professor of clothing and textiles, University of Texas, Austin, Texas; and W. Clark Ellzey, Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri. A course in textiles and

clothing will be offered by Miss Spratt. A three-hour course in curriculum will be taught by Miss Segner, assisted by Miss Hill. Mr. Ellzey will teach a course in family relationships. Miss Segner will also offer courses in methods of teaching home economics.

Professor Eugene F. Mitchell, head of the industrial education department, attended a Southern Regional Conference in Houston, Texas, March 24-26.

At the first annual meeting of the Southwestern Council on Family Relations March 14 and 15 at the St. John High School, Shreveport, Louisiana, Mrs. Annette Boutwell, health education specialist for the Extension Service at Mississippi State College, told about the activities of the Starkville Community Council, in which she is one of the leaders. Her talk on this important project was the topic for discussion at the Saturday morning session of the council.

Dr. Ben Wofford of the economics department has been elected president of the Mississippi State College chapter of the American Association of University Professors.